DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 387 481 SP 036 265

TITLE	Mentor Teacher Internship Program, 1993-94. OER Report.
INSTITUTION	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, NY. Office of Educational Research.
PUB DATE	1 Aug 94
NOTE	60p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Beginning Teacher Induction; Classroom Techniques; Elementary Secondary Education; Inservice Teacher Education; Internship Programs; *Mentors; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; *Teacher Interns; Teacher Persistence
IDENTIFIERS	Experienced Teachers; New York City Board of Education; *New York State Mentor Teacher Internship Program; *Protege Mentor Relationship; United Federation of Teachers

ABSTRACT

The Mentor Teacher Internship Program (MTIP), a program designed to pair experienced mentor teachers with newly hired uncertified teachers, was evaluated for 1993-94. The purpose of the program is to provide non-evaluative and confidential collegial support for the interns, enabling them to develop effective teaching methods and encouraging them to remain as teachers in New York City public schools. Survey questionnaires were sent to all 1,294 mentors, 2,613 interns, 41 district liaisons, 38 United Federation of Teacher (UFT, a collaborating partner in the project), district representatives, 68 principals, and 68 chapter leaders. In addition, evaluators reviewed a sample of mentors' activity logs. Results found that overall interns were quite satisfied with the help they received. Other findings include the following: (1) mentor most often shared information, products, and encouraged deliberation of options on coaching their interns; (2) instructional strategies and classroom management were typically the focus o the mentor-intern conferences; (3) interns felt that they particularly benefited from the discussion of professional practices with their mentors and from mentors' encouragement and support. Overall results indicated that the program had accomplished its major goals. Includes specific recommendations based on the evaluation. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 387 481

SP

OER Report

Mentor Teacher Internship Program
1993-94

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Fabrizio

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Office of Educational Research
BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

SP036065

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mentor Teacher Internship Program
1993-94

BOARD OF EDUCATION
OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Carol A. Gresser
President

Irene H. Impellizzeri
Vice President

Louis DeSario
Sandra E. Lerner
Luis O. Reyes
Ninfa Segarra-Vélez
William C. Thompson, Jr.
Members

Tiffany Raspberry
Student Advisory Member

Ramon C. Cortines
Chancellor

9/1/94

It is the policy of the Board of Education of the City School District of the City of New York not to discriminate on the basis of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, age, disability, marital status, sexual orientation, or sex in its educational programs, activities, and employment policies, and to maintain an environment free of sexual harassment, as required by law. Inquiries regarding compliance with appropriate laws may be directed to Frederick A. Hill, Jr., Director (Acting), Office of Equal Opportunity, 110 Livingston Street, Room 601, Brooklyn, New York 11201, Telephone: (718) 935-3320

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Mentor Teacher Internship Program (M.T.I.P.) is a collaborative program of the Board of Education of the City of New York and the United Federation of Teachers (U.F.T.). The program matches experienced teachers (mentors) with newly hired, uncertified teachers (interns). The purpose of the program is to provide non-evaluative and confidential collegial support for the interns, thus enabling them to develop effective teaching methods and encouraging them to remain as teachers in New York City public schools. The overall goal, then, of the M.T.I.P. is to develop and maintain a highly skilled and professional teaching force for New York City public schools.

Section 80.18 of the New York State Regulations of the Commissioner of Education stipulated that all interns were to receive at least four mentoring periods per week. These four periods included two periods in which the mentor was in the intern's classroom and two other periods in which the intern conferred with the mentor and visited either the classroom of the mentor or that of a colleague. The program also offered interns a tuition-free after-school graduate-level course, and offered new mentors a two-hour orientation and all mentors an 18-hour peer coaching course.

The evaluators of the Board of Education's Office of Educational Research (OER) sent survey questionnaires to all of the mentors, interns, district liaisons, and U.F.T. district representatives. Evaluators also sent questionnaires to samples of principals and chapter leaders. In addition, OER evaluators reviewed a sample of mentors' activity logs.

The interns who responded to the questionnaire had taught an average of less than one year in their present schools and typically had attained a bachelor's degree. The majority were uncertified, lacking either the National Teachers' Examination and/or the necessary education credits.

The mentors who responded to the questionnaire had taught an average of 13 years in their present schools and 21 years overall, and typically had attained a master's degree plus 30 credits. More than one-half of the mentor respondents had served in the program in previous years. The majority appeared to be serving in the recommended mentor model in that most were active teachers, were teaching in the same school as their interns, and were mentoring either one or two interns.

A Mentor Advisory Selection Committee (MASC) was responsible for selection of mentors and other administrative tasks. Questionnaire responses of the district liaisons and district

representatives indicated that they had given some priority to choosing mentors who were experienced mentors, active teachers and matched by license to the interns. Accordingly, the majority of the mentors were experienced mentors and active teachers. However, slightly more than one-half of the intern respondents reported that they were not matched by license to their mentors, although most were matched in some respect, by grade level, special students or program. Approximately one-quarter of the mentor respondents and one-quarter of the intern respondents expressed a desire for changes in mentor-intern matching in the future.

Program scheduling was difficult in 1993-94 because the start of the school year was delayed due to the removal of asbestos in the schools. When the school year did begin, some schools were still not completely useable, forcing double-shifts and use of alternate space. Perhaps for this reason, close to one-half of the mentor respondents indicated that scheduling of the program could be improved in the future and approximately one-third of the mentors reported receiving fewer than the required number of released periods (typically receiving two of the required three).

The mentors' questionnaire responses indicated that M.T.I.P. activities differed somewhat according to level of school. Overall, mentors most often shared information/products and encouraged deliberation of options in coaching their interns. The mentors' questionnaire responses and mentor logs both indicated that instructional strategies and classroom management were typically the focus of the mentor-intern conferences. The interns' questionnaire responses indicated that the interns felt that they had particularly benefitted from the discussions of professional practices with their mentors and from the encouragement and support of their mentors.

Both mentor and intern respondents indicated that they had benefitted from participation in the M.T.I.P. The mentors who had attended the 18-hour peer coaching workshops gave the workshops high ratings in providing an understanding of the program, providing an opportunity to share information with other mentors, and improving peer coaching skills. The mentors also gave the M.T.I.P. overall high ratings in its contribution to their own professional development, and its contribution to increasing their professional satisfaction, their skills as a coach, and their awareness of their own teaching methods. Furthermore, they credited their interns with helping them in a number of ways, such as giving feedback on demonstrations and sharing both literature on teaching/curriculum and lesson plans.

Close to one-half of the interns had taken an after-school graduate course as part of the M.T.I.P. and almost all of those interns thought that the course would help them to meet the

requirements for certification. In addition, almost all of those interns reported that they had been able to apply strategies learned in their course to their classroom teaching and had experienced a helpful sharing with their colleagues in the course. The interns, in general, were satisfied with the help that they had received from the M.T.I.P. and felt that the level of support they had received from supervisors and colleagues had increased as a result of their participation in the M.T.I.P.

Both mentor and intern responses supported the conclusion that the M.T.I.P. had accomplished its major goals. Both groups of respondents rated the program highly in its effectiveness in improving the interns' ability to intruct and improving the probability that the interns would continue to teach in the New York City public schools. Ratings of program effectiveness tended to be higher for mentors and interns who had been matched by license than for those who had not been matched by license.

Based on the findings of the evaluation, OER makes the following specific recommendations.

- The M.T.I.P. should be retained as a way to increase and maintain an effective teaching force in the N.Y.C. public schools.

- The M.T.I.P. should begin as early in the school year as possible, in order to minimize classroom disruption and maximize benefit to the new teachers.

- The strongest emphasis in selection of mentors should be placed on matching mentors to interns, with less emphasis on the mentor being an active teacher in the same school as the intern. The data indicated that mentor-intern match influenced the achievement of the M.T.I.P. goals, presumably because matched mentors are better able to communicate with and to guide their interns.

- To facilitate an early start to the program and appropriate mentor-intern matching, an effort should be made to broaden the mentor pool, either by increased use of retirees or by offering a variety of incentives to active teachers.

- Funding should allow all mentors, whether new or experienced, to attend the initial two-hour orientation in order to acquaint them with changes in program organization.

- All mentors should be provided with the full complement of released periods stipulated in the program guidelines to enable them to visit the intern's classroom and participate in a weekly mentor-intern conference.

- If high quality coverage is not available for mentors, then either district provision of staff development for coverage teachers should be instituted or alternate arrangements such as increased use of retirees, cluster teachers, or district-office mentors should be considered.

- Future evaluations should pay some attention to the differences between the organization and effects of the M.T.I.P. in elementary schools vs. intermediate/junior high schools, and high schools.

- The Office of Monitoring and School Improvement must verify and insure that members are receiving the periods they are entitled to in order to serve their interns.

- Continue the college course component for the interns' skills development and application in the classroom, and increase the dissemination of this service so that more interns have the opportunity to enroll in courses.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report was prepared by the Office of Educational Research's High School Evaluation Unit (O.E.R./H.S.E.U.) of the Board of Education of the City of New York, under the direction of Dr. Lori Mei. Thanks to Dr. Linda Solomon for coordinating the evaluation, designing the instruments, conducting site visits, and writing the report.

Additional copies of this report are available by writing to:

Dr. Lori Mei
Office of Educational Research
High School Evaluation Unit
110 Livingston Street, Room 740
Brooklyn, NY 11201

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY		i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		v
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Program Background	1
	Program Components	1
	Evaluation Methodology	3
	Scope of this Report	3
II.	PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION	4
	Participants	4
	Organization and Administration	7
	M.T.I.P. Activities	14
III.	OUTCOMES	25
	Interns' Outcomes	25
	Mentors' Outcomes	27
	Retention of Interns	40
IV.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	46

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1:	Number and Percent of Respondents Able to Apply Strategies Learned in Their After-School Course to Their Classroom Teaching	18
Table 2:	Number and Percent of Respondents Who Felt That They Experienced a Helpful Sharing with their Colleagues in the Course	20
Table 3:	Number and Percent of Respondents Giving Various Reasons for Not Taking an After-School Graduate Course as Part of the M.T.I.P.	21
Table 4:	Number and Percent of Respondents Indicating an Interest in Various Courses Not Offered as Part of the M.T.I.P.	22
Table 5:	Mean Ratings of Effectiveness of Program by Mentors as a Function of Mentor Model	29
Table 6:	Mean Ratings of Effectiveness of Program by Mentors who Entered M.T.I.P. in 1993 or 1994	30
Table 7:	Mean Ratings of Effectiveness of Program by Mentors Matched or Not Matched by License to Interns	31
Table 8:	Mean Ratings of Effectiveness of Program by Interns in Various Mentor Models	35
Table 9:	Mean Ratings of Effectiveness of Program by Interns who Entered M.T.I.P. in 1993 or 1994	36
Table 10:	Mean Ratings of Effectiveness of Program by Interns Matched or Not Matched by License to Mentor	38
Table 11:	Mean Ratings of Comfort in Professional Areas by Mentored and Unmentored Respondents	39
Table 12:	Mean Ratings of Comfort in Professional Areas by Interns in Various Mentor Models	41
Table 13:	Mean Ratings of Comfort in Professional Areas by Interns Matched or Not Matched by License to Mentor	42
Table 14:	Intention to Teach of Mentored and Unmentored Respondents	44

I. INTRODUCTION

PROGRAM BACKGROUND

The Mentor Teacher Internship Program (M.T.I.P.) is a collaborative program of the Board of Education of the City of New York and the United Federation of Teachers (U.F.T.). The program, first implemented in 1986, was suspended in 1991 because of budgetary constraints, reestablished during the 1992-93 school year in response to Section 80.18* of the New York State Regulations of the Commissioner of Education, and continued during the 1993-94 school year.

The program matches experienced teachers (mentors) with eligible, newly hired, uncertified teachers (interns). The purpose of the program is to provide non-evaluative and confidential collegial support for the interns, thus enabling the interns to develop effective teaching methods and encouraging them to remain as teachers in New York City public schools.

PROGRAM COMPONENTS

The overall goal of the M.T.I.P. is to develop and maintain a highly skilled and professional teaching force for New York City public schools. The professional development activities of the M.T.I.P. take place both during and after school. As specified in the Chancellor's Special Circular No. 12, all interns receive four mentoring program periods per week. This includes two directed preparation periods (one being a conference

---

*Section 80.18 of the New York State Regulations of the Commissioner mandates that all eligible Preparatory Provisional Teachers (P.P.T.s) receive mentoring.

with the mentor) and two periods during which the mentor is in the intern's classroom. Activities of interns and mentors may include demonstration lessons, coaching, and intervisitations. In addition, each intern may register for a tuition-free, after-school three-credit graduate level course. New mentors are provided with a two-hour after-school orientation to the program and all mentors are provided with an 18 hour district-based Peer Coaching Course for Mentors.

The Chancellor's Special Circular No. 12 recommended that the School-Based Current Staff Part-Time Mentor Model be used to provide mentoring to one or two new teachers in each school. This model uses mentors who are currently teaching in the same school as the interns. If a school cannot use this model, alternative models may be used with the approval of the Mentor Program. The alternative models include the School-Based Current Staff Extended Mentor Model in which the mentor serves three to six interns in his/her own school; the Mentor on Unpaid Leave/Retiree Mentor Model in which a mentor on unpaid leave or a retiree serves two interns in one day; the Itinerant Current Staff Mentor model in which a mentor serves up to six interns in one or two schools; or the Intensified Secondary School Mentor Model in which a mentor serves one intern who receives six mentoring preparation periods for one semester only.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The evaluators of the Board of Education's Office of Educational Research (OER) sent survey questionnaires to all of the mentors (N = 1294) and all of the interns who had been paired with mentors (N = 2613). Evaluators also sent questionnaires to a sample of 68 principals and 68 chapter leaders, representing all of the school districts, high schools, and special education programs, and questionnaires to the 41 district liaisons, and the 38 U.F.T. district representatives. In addition, OER evaluators reviewed a sample of mentors' activity logs.

SCOPE OF THIS REPORT

This report presents OER's evaluation of the 1993-94 Mentor Teacher Internship Program. Chapter II presents a discussion of implementation, Chapter III an analysis of outcomes, and Chapter IV conclusions and recommendations.

II. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

PARTICIPANTS

Profile of Interns

In May, 1994, OER evaluators sent 2613 questionnaires to interns who had been paired with mentors. According to the program records, 1356 (52 percent) of those interns had entered the program in the fall of 1993 and 1257 (48 percent) in the spring of 1994. Three hundred and thirty-nine of the fall interns (25 percent) and 314 of the spring interns (25 percent) returned the questionnaire.

When OER evaluators read the returned questionnaires, they determined that 63 teachers in the spring intern group did not seem to have met with a mentor. For the purpose of analysis, those teachers were considered to constitute an unmentored control group, thus reducing the intern group to 590 respondents.

Overall, the intern and control respondents represented schools in all community school districts and the divisions of high schools and special education. As with the mentors, the majority were teaching regular education students (N = 352, 54 percent), with smaller numbers teaching special education (N = 215, 33 percent) and/or bilingual education (N = 181, 28 percent). Respondents were approximately equally divided between those who were teaching in elementary schools (N = 265, 41 percent), intermediate or junior high schools (N = 162, 25 percent), and high schools (N = 188, 29 percent). Of those who were teaching at the intermediate/junior high/high school level,

the majority were teaching either math/science (N = 131, 22 percent) or English/speech (N = 87, 15 percent).

As with the mentors, the majority of the intern and control respondents were female (N = 388, 61 percent). Unlike the mentors, the majority of the intern and control respondents had attained a bachelor's degree (N = 496, 76 percent), rather than a master's degree or a master's degree plus 30 credits.

To be eligible for the M.T.I.P., an intern was required to be newly hired in the N.Y.C. public schools and lacking the education credits and/or the student teaching/experience required for a New York State teaching certificate. Consistent with this guideline, 84 percent (N = 282) of respondents who became interns in the fall of 1993 and 93 percent (N = 230) of those who became interns in the spring of 1994 reported that they were not certified. In the control group, 89 percent (N = 55) reported that they were not certified.

Respondents who were not certified most often had not completed the National Teachers' Examination (N = 361, 51 percent) and/or the necessary education credits (N = 366, 52 percent). A small percentage did not have the necessary student teaching experience (N = 157, 22 percent).

Profile of Mentors

In May 1994, OER evaluators sent questionnaires to 1294 mentors. Seven hundred and nine returned the questionnaires, a return rate of 55 percent. This return rate is excellent for a single administration of a mail survey.

The respondents represented 290 schools in all 32 community school districts, the Division of High Schools, and the Division of Special Education. Approximately two-thirds (N = 478, 67 percent) were female. The majority had attained either a master's degree plus 30 credits (N = 507, 72 percent) or a master's degree alone (N = 113, 16 percent).

Section 80.18 of the New York State Regulations of the Commissioner of Education stipulated that all mentors possess at least five years of successful teaching experience in the New York City (N.Y.C.) public schools. On the average, the mentor respondents had taught 13 years in their present schools and 21 years overall. The majority of the mentor respondents were teaching regular education students (N = 430, 61 percent), with smaller numbers teaching special education (N = 168, 24 percent) and bilingual students (N = 168, 24 percent). Respondents were approximately equally divided between those who were teaching in elementary schools (N = 231, 36 percent), intermediate or junior high schools (N = 181, 29 percent), and high schools (N = 178, 28 percent). Of those teaching in the intermediate/junior high/high schools, the largest number were teaching either math/science (N = 102, 27 percent) or English/speech (N = 70, 19 percent). More than one-half of the mentor respondents (N = 375, 53 percent) had served in the program in previous year(s).

Profile of Administrative Respondents

In May, 1994, OER evaluators sent questionnaires to a number of those who had administrative functions in the M.T.I.P.,

including the 41 district liaisons and 38 U.F.T. district representatives, and a random sample of 68 U.F.T. chapter leaders and 68 principals from elementary, intermediate/junior high schools, high schools, and special education. Twenty-one district liaisons (47 percent return rate), 19 district representatives (47 percent return rate), 18 chapter leaders (26 percent return rate), and 34 principals (50 percent return rate) returned the questionnaire.

ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

Administrative and Supporting Personnel

A Mentor Advisory Selection Committee (MASC), a 12-member group that was either district-based or high-school-based (including a majority of teachers selected by the United Federation of Teachers) was responsible for selection of mentors and for other administrative tasks. Mandated responsibilities of the MASC included reviewing mentor applications, interviewing mentor candidates, matching mentors to interns, and submitting recommendations to the superintendent for approval.

At the central level, M.T.I.P. staff at the Office of Special Programs of the Board of Education of the City of New York played a crucial role in coordinating and administering the program. These staff members served as liaisons to the teachers' and supervisors' union and also to the State Education Department. They were involved in every stage of implementation of the program. Their functions, which were performed in collaboration with the UFT, included designing program guidelines

and orientation materials for the MASCs, mentors, and district liaisons, conducting orientations for MASCs and district liaisons, training the trainers of the two-hour mentor orientation, assessing eligibility of interns, collaborating with the Office of Monitoring and School Improvement, designing, providing and collecting mentor program cards and log forms, and providing information on implementation to the state and to the chancellor.

Other personnel with important roles in the MASC and in the organization of the program in the field included the district liaisons (designees of the district superintendents) and the U.F.T. district representatives. The majority of the district liaisons who returned their questionnaires to OER (N = 17, 81 percent) reported that they were members of the MASC and the majority of those said that they were also the chair of the MASC (N = 11, 65 percent). The remaining district liaisons reported that they attended MASC meetings as resource persons. Approximately one-half of the district liaisons (N = 9, 43 percent) reported that they played a role in selecting the MASC; moreover, as members of MASC, all played a role in the selection of mentors and more than one-half (N = 14, 67 percent) played a role in matching mentors to interns. All of the district liaisons (N = 21) reported that they coordinated implementation of the M.T.I.P and the majority of the liaisons reported that they played a number of other important organizational roles in the M.T.I.P., including for example, disseminating information (N

= 20, 95 percent), conferring with principals (N = 18, 86 percent), advertising mentor openings (N = 17, 81 percent), monitoring implementation (N = 16, 76 percent), attending central program meetings (N = 14, 67 percent), and conferring with chapter leaders (N = 12, 57 percent).

U.F.T. district representatives who returned their questionnaires (N = 19) all reported that they were members of the MASC, with smaller numbers than liaisons (N = 4, 21 percent) serving as chair of the MASC. As one would expect, as members of the MASC, virtually all (N = 18, 95 percent) reported that they played a role in the selection of the mentors; and a slightly smaller group (N = 13, 68 percent) reported that they played a role in matching mentors to interns. The majority reported that they played a number of other important roles in the M.T.I.P., distinct from those played by the liaisons, including participating in the mentors' peer coaching course (N = 15, 79 percent), appointing the teacher MASC members (N = 15, 79 percent) and conferring with the MASC chairs on the calendar of MASC meetings (N = 15, 79 percent)..

Each school participating in the M.T.I.P. has a U.F.T. chapter leader, each of whom may have played some role in the M.T.I.P. Of those who returned their questionnaires to OER, one-third reported that they were members of the MASC and half of those (N = 3, 17 percent) were chairs of the MASC. In addition, approximately one-third (N = 7, 39 percent) of the chapter leaders reported that they distributed mentor applications and

approximately one-third (N = 7, 39 percent) said that they consulted with the MASC about mentor-intern matches. In response to an open-ended question on potential changes in the role of chapter leaders in the M.T.I.P., several respondents indicated a desire for more input into mentor selection and mentor-intern matching.

While participating in the M.T.I.P., each mentor received some support from other school and district personnel. The mentors who responded to the OER questionnaire were most likely to have requested support from other teachers (N = 506, 75 percent), followed by the principal (N = 369, 54 percent), and other mentors (N = 343, 53 percent). Less than one-half of the mentors reported requesting support from the U.F.T. chapter leader (N = 272, 41 percent), the district office (N = 169, 26 percent), or the U.F.T. district representative (N = 146, 22 percent). However, the majority of those who requested support from any source reported receiving a high level of support, particularly from the principals (N = 263, 71 percent), other mentors (N = 240, 70 percent) and other teachers (N = 332, 66 percent).

Selection of Mentors

Program coordinators recommended that interns be served by an active teacher within their own school, rather than a teacher in another school, in order to facilitate intervisitation and integration of the intern into the school. The majority of the mentor respondents to the OER questionnaire appeared to be

serving in the recommended mentor model. The majority of them were teaching in the same school as their interns (N = 484, 70 percent), and the majority were mentoring either one (N = 311, 44 percent) or two (N = 260, 37 percent) interns. However, some of the mentors reported that they were receiving only zero (N = 20, 4 percent), one (N = 42, 9 percent) or two (N = 124, 25 percent) periods of released time per intern. Three periods of released time to serve one intern (five periods to serve two interns) is specified by New York State Regulations of the Commissioner of Education, Section 80.18, and is essential to allow the mentors to fulfill their obligations to their interns. These obligations include two periods in the interns' classrooms and one additional period in a mentor-intern conference.

Program guidelines further stipulated that qualified current teachers should be selected as mentors in preference to retirees or teachers on unpaid leave. Consistent with this guideline, some of the U.F.T. district representatives (N = 9, 69 percent) and the district liaisons (N = 5, 36 percent) who responded to the OER questionnaire noted that, in selecting mentors, they gave top priority to the mentor being an active teacher rather than retired. Accordingly, only one-quarter (N = 179, 26 percent) of the 1993-94 mentor respondents were retired or on leave.

In addition, program guidelines stated that mentors should be matched to interns by license whenever possible. Consistent with this guideline, most of the U.F.T. district representatives (N = 10, 77 percent) and some of the district liaisons (N = 4, 28

percent) who responded to the OER questionnaire noted that, in selecting mentors, they gave top priority to similarity in license area of the intern. However, an appropriately matched mentor (particularly one within the intern's own school) was not always available. Accordingly, a considerable proportion of the mentor respondents (N = 296, 42 percent) reported that they were not matched by license to any of their interns. An even larger proportion of the intern respondents (N = 336, 58 percent) reported that they were not matched by license to their mentors, although the majority were matched in some respect, by grade level, special students or program. Approximately one-quarter (N = 194, 27 percent) of the mentor respondents checked 'match between mentor and intern' as an aspect of the program that could be improved in the future. Moreover, a better match between mentor and intern was most often (N = 53, 24 percent) cited by interns in response to an open-ended question on how to improve the program. As noted later in this report, the license match between mentor and intern appeared to be important in influencing the effect of the program. Hence, broadening the mentor pool should be a priority in future planning.

Provision of Coverage for Mentors

Once mentors had been assigned to interns, it was necessary to provide coverage for those mentors who were active teachers. This coverage was provided in a variety of ways. Of those respondents who indicated that another teacher had replaced them, 119 (55 percent) reported coverage by an internal school staff

coverage teacher; 86 (40 percent) by a long term part-time coverage teacher and 11 (5 percent) by a recently retired coverage teacher. Of those respondents who indicated that they had not been replaced, 216 (54 percent) were given a reduced schedule, 111 (28 percent) were retired, and the remainder had made a variety of other arrangements.

The 250 mentor respondents who rated the quality of classroom coverage gave it a mean rating of 3.63 on a 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) scale, with approximately 16 percent (N = 41) of respondents rating coverage as only 1 or 2, indicating that some of the respondents may not have been very satisfied with their coverage. Approximately one-fourth of the respondents (N = 182, 26 percent) checked classroom coverage for mentor-intern as an aspect of the program that could be improved in the future. In response to a subsequent open-ended question, respondents listed some of their problems with coverage. These included substitutes who changed from day to day, or were late, or absent, or did not provide a learning experience for the students. Mentors' suggestions for alternate arrangements to minimize classroom disruption included provision of salary instead of coverage, use of cluster teachers, or full-time mentors from the district office, or increased use of retirees. Two of these options--use of cluster teachers and full-time mentors from the district office--are already being utilized.

M.T.I.P. ACTIVITIES

Coaching by Mentors

Program guidelines stipulated that M.T.I.P. activities should begin as soon as possible after the receipt of the special circular on Sept. 30, 1993. In fact, according to program records, as noted earlier, approximately one-half of the interns (N = 1257, 48 percent) entered the program in the spring of 1994. The mentor respondents indicated a similar distribution of entering dates, with 43 percent (N = 289) having entered in the spring of 1994. Furthermore, those interns and mentors who entered in the fall of 1993 typically did so in November or December (mentors: N = 264, 71 percent; interns: N = 124, 48 percent). Several factors might account for the fact that the program arrangements were not in place in September of 1993. Most importantly, in the fall of 1993, the start of the school year was delayed due to the presence of asbestos in the schools. Further, even when schools were officially opened, some schools were not asbestos-free, and students in those schools were assigned to alternate sites with crowded conditions or double-shifts. In response to a questionnaire item concerning other reasons for delay, the majority of the principal respondents (N = 27, 84 percent) indicated that late funding of the program was not a problem. Instead, some noted that replacing quality teachers in the classroom and scheduling substitute coverage created difficulties. Similarly, 45 percent (N = 318) of mentor

respondents checked 'scheduling' and 26 percent (N = 182) checked 'classroom coverage' as aspects of the M.T.I.P. that could be improved in the future. District liaison respondents discussed analogous issues, citing in addition the lack of appropriate mentors. Liaison respondents made some suggestions concerning broadening the mentor pool by adding greater inducements to apply for the position--offering additional administration periods or including the mentoring experience as a requirement for a supervisory license. Mentors' suggestions for change noted earlier and relevant again here included increased use of retirees.

In response to the OER questionnaire, mentors described their coaching sessions with their interns, rating the frequency of occurrence of activities and issues on a 4-point scale from 1 (never) to 4 (often). Regarding activities, mentors reported that they most frequently shared information/products ($\underline{M}$ = 3.81) or encouraged deliberation of choices ($\underline{M}$ = 3.36), and less frequently directed action ($\underline{M}$ = 2.83). This ordering of activities reflects the supportive role of the mentors, their mandate being to allow the agenda of the intern to guide their coaching activities. Regarding issues, mentors reported that the sessions most frequently dealt with instruction ($\underline{M}$ = 3.45) and getting students to cooperate ($\underline{M}$ = 3.11), and less frequently with school/working environment ($\underline{M}$ = 2.89), administrative tasks ($\underline{M}$ = 2.67), and parents ($\underline{M}$ = 2.13).

The questionnaire data on the coaching sessions were supplemented by responses in monthly logs submitted by the mentors. OER personnel tabulated the data from a sample of the logs of 30 mentors, one-half in elementary or intermediate/junior high schools and one-half in high schools. Each mentor had coached one or more interns for approximately four periods per week for a total of approximately 16 periods per month, yielding a total of 349 entries. The log data revealed that in both the elementary/intermediate/junior high schools and the high schools, the most frequent categories of activity were coaching/viewing/intervisitation (elementary/intermediate/junior high: 34 percent; high school: 37 percent) and discussing/consulting/assisting (elementary/intermediate/junior high: 21 percent; high school: 29 percent). The remaining activities showed a somewhat different pattern in elementary-intermediate/junior high schools than in the high schools. Demonstrating was a more common activity in the elementary/intermediate/junior high schools than in the high schools (16 percent vs. 5 percent). Designing/developing/preparing/planning were more common activities in the high schools than in the elementary/intermediate/junior high schools (19 percent vs. 12 percent). These data indicate a potential focus for further evaluation of the M.T.I.P. that is not explored in this report. The organization and the outcome of the M.T.I.P. may differ in the elementary schools, intermediate/junior high schools, and the high schools. This suggestion is supported by comments of the district liaison respondents. Some

suggested more attention to differences between the M.T.I.P. in high schools and in community school districts.

Regarding issues discussed during mentoring sessions, log data supported the questionnaire data, and the patterns were similar for both elementary/intermediate school mentors and high school mentors. In the logs, as in the questionnaire responses, instructional strategies and classroom management were the most frequently cited issues (elementary/intermediate: 32 percent; 16 percent; high school: 33 percent, 15 percent). Other issues that appeared at both levels, although less often, were educational materials (elementary/intermediate: 9 percent; high school: 11 percent) and preparation of lesson plans (elementary/intermediate: 8 percent; high school: 14 percent).

Staff Development

Interns. The 1993-94 M.T.I.P., as in 1992-93, offered interns an opportunity to attend an accredited graduate-level course to aid them in fulfilling their certification requirements. Close to one-half (N = 244, 40 percent) of the respondents indicated that they had taken an after-school graduate course as part of the M.T.I.P. These respondents indicated that the courses had been helpful to them. Almost all of the respondents who had taken a course (N = 234, 91 percent) thought that the course would help them to meet the requirements for certification. In addition, as shown in Table 1, almost all of the respondents who had taken a course (N = 286, 97 percent) felt that they were able to apply strategies learned in their

Table 1

Number and Percent of Respondents Able to Apply Strategies Learned in Their After-School Course to Their Classroom Teaching

	Fall Interns		Spring Interns		Total	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Often Apply	84	53	42	48	126	51
Sometimes Apply	71	45	41	47	112	46
Never Apply	3	2	4	5	7	3

- Overall, almost all (97 percent) of the respondents who had taken or were taking an after-school graduate course felt that they were able to apply strategies learned in their M.T.I.P. course to their classroom teaching.

M.T.I.P. course to their classroom teaching. Finally, as shown in Table 2, almost all of the respondents who had taken a course (N = 230, 95 percent) felt that they had experienced a helpful sharing with their colleagues in the course.

As shown in Table 3, those who had not taken an M.T.I.P. course most often indicated that they had not been aware that they were eligible or had not received the brochure. Interns who entered in the spring were more likely to respond in this way than were interns who entered in the fall. In addition, some of the respondents who had not taken an M.T.I.P. course indicated that they did not find the days and times convenient, and some of the respondents, as shown in Table 4, indicated that they would have been interested in courses other than the ones that were offered. However, it should be noted that other respondents indicated that they had no need of an M.T.I.P. course because they were already enrolled in a master's or graduate program.

Mentor Workshops. Section 80.18 of the New York State Regulations of the Commissioner of Education directed that new mentors be provided with a two-hour program orientation facilitated by district staff. These regulations also stipulated that mentors be provided with 18 hours of district-based professional development based on the course "Peer Coaching for Mentors" during the school year.

Few of the respondents (N = 191, 27 percent) reported that they had attended the two-hour orientation; however, a majority (N = 417, 59 percent) reported that they had taken part in the

Table 2

Number and Percent of Respondents Who Felt That They Experienced a Helpful Sharing with their Colleagues in the Course

	Fall Interns		Spring Interns		Total	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Often Shared	71	46	38	44	109	45
Sometimes Shared	78	50	43	50	121	50
Never Shared	7	4	5	6	12	5

- Overall, almost all of the respondents (95 percent) who had taken or were taking an after-school graduate course felt that they experienced a helpful sharing with their colleagues in the course.

Table 3

Number and Percent of Respondents Giving Various Reasons for Not Taking an After-School Graduate Course as Part of the M.T.I.P.

Reasons	Fall Interns No.	Fall Interns Percent	Spring Interns No.	Spring Interns Percent	Total No.	Total Percent[a]
Unaware of Eligibility	64	36	92	49	156	43
Didn't Receive Brochure	52	29	93	50	145	40
Times/Places Not Convenient	50	28	43	23	93	26
Pressures of Teaching	28	16	35	19	63	17
Locations Not Convenient	24	13	23	12	47	13
Courses Not Meeting Needs	21	12	18	10	39	11
Other	52	29	28	15	80	22

[a]Each respondent checked as many reasons as appropriate. Percents are based on the total number of respondents (N = 363).

- All of the respondents who reported that they had not and were not taking an after-school graduate course checked reasons for not taking such a course.
- The most common reasons for not taking an after-school graduate course were: "not aware of eligibility" and/or "did not receive brochure."
- A higher percent of spring interns than fall interns indicated that they had not taken an after-school graduate course because they were "not aware of their eligibility" and/or "did not receive the brochure."
- Twenty-two percent of the respondents checked the response "other" as a reason for not taking an after-school graduate course. Most often (N = 42, 51 percent of those checking "other"), these respondents indicated that they were not taking a course as part of the M.T.I.P. because they were already enrolled in a master's program or graduate program.

Table 4

Number and Percent of Respondents Indicating an Interest in Various Courses Not Offered as Part of the M.T.I.P.

	Fall Interns		Spring Interns		Total	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent[a]
Curriculum	141	49	96	41	237	45
Computer-aided Instruction	114	40	86	37	200	38
Integrating Arts into the Curriculum	114	40	83	35	197	38
Texts/Materials	108	38	92	39	200	38
Teaching of Writing	106	37	81	34	187	36
Student Evaluation	108	38	80	34	188	36
Antidotes to Burnout	81	28	82	35	163	31
Dropout Prevention	65	23	50	21	115	22
AIDS Education	54	19	39	17	93	18
Child Abuse/Neglect	54	19	38	16	92	18
Sex Education	45	16	44	19	89	17
Other	167	58	148	62	315	60

[a]Each respondent checked as many courses as appropriate. Percents are based on the total number of respondents (N = 522) to the question.

- Eighty-five percent (N = 522) of the 612 respondents who replied to any of the questions on the after-school graduate course indicated an interest in taking courses that had not been offered by the M.T.I.P.

- In the most frequent responses, more than one-third of the respondents indicated that they were interested in taking a course in curriculum, computer-aided instruction, integrating the arts into the curriculum, texts/materials, teaching writing or student evaluation.

18-hour district-based course. These numbers reflect the fact that many of the mentors (N = 375, 53 percent) had mentored previously and thus were not eligible to take the two-hour orientation; indeed 219 (31 percent) respondents indicated that they had attended a peer coaching course prior to 1993-94 and another 59 (8 percent) said that they had attended other relevant faculty development courses. In addition, some of the mentors noted, in response to open-ended questions, that they had either been appointed after the courses had begun or after the courses in their district had reached capacity enrollment.

The OER questionnaire asked the mentors to rate the workshops on several 4-point (1 = not effective, 4 = highly effective) rating scales. On all items, the mean ratings were above 3, indicating a favorable attitude toward the workshops. The most positive response was to the item 'providing an understanding of the program' ($\underline{M}$ = 3.42), followed by 'providing an opportunity to share information with other mentors' ($\underline{M}$ = 3.32) and 'improving your peer coaching skills' ($\underline{M}$ = 3.07). Responses to an open-ended question on ways to improve the course in the future included such positive comments as "course was informative and interesting" and "trainer was extremely helpful" by a number of the respondents (N = 43, 17 percent). Some of the suggestions for change by a substantial number of respondents included: begin the course before mentoring begins (N = 69, 28 percent), a suggestion that funding provisions would not allow; more opportunity for discussion of particular problems and

specific solutions (N = 51, 20 percent); and meetings of mentors and interns, particularly during the orientation phase (N = 45, 18 percent), a change which was implemented during the 1994-95 school year.

III. OUTCOMES

OER data indicated that participation had positive effects on both the mentors and the interns.

INTERNS' OUTCOMES

Interns' Satisfaction With the M.T.I.P.

Overall, intern respondents were quite satisfied with the help that they received from the M.T.I.P., rating their satisfaction as approximately 4 (M = 3.96) on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (not satisfied) to 5 (very satisfied). Interns also indicated that the level of support they were receiving from supervisors and colleagues had changed for the better since they began to participate in the M.T.I.P., rating the change as close to 4 (M = 3.74) on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (decreased very much) through 3 (no change) to 5 (increased very much).

Statistical analyses indicated that interns' ratings of satisfaction with the help they received from the M.T.I.P. were not different for those who entered the program in 1993 versus 1994 (M = 3.69 vs. M = 3.79) or for those with mentors in their own schools, different schools, or retired/on leave (M = 4.0, M = 4.29, M = 3.92). However, satisfaction was greater for those who were matched by license to their mentors (M = 4.16) than for those who were not matched by license to

their mentors (M = 3.82, t = 3.46, p = .01), echoing the effect of matching on mentors' satisfaction with the program.

To assess the importance of specific activities of the M.T.I.P., interns were asked to rate each item on a list of M.T.I.P. activities on a 4-point scale from 1 (not beneficial) to 4 (highly beneficial). Results indicated that the interns found all of the listed activities to be beneficial, with discussions of professional practices rated most highly (M = 3.32) and demonstration lessons (M = 3.20), viewing/coaching (M = 3.20), and intervisitation (M = 3.02) slightly less. Interns were also asked to rate specific aspects of the M.T.I.P. Results indicated that the interns found all of the listed aspects to be beneficial, with encouragement/support being rated most highly (M = 3.54) and sharing of materials/plans (M = 3.31), coaching in specific skills (M = 3.26) and mentor being non-evaluative (M = 3.01) slightly less. The data indicate that the interns felt positively about the M.T.I.P. as it was constituted in 1993-94 and the pattern of responses is consistent with data in other literature* indicating that new teachers most value the emotional support that they receive from their mentors.

---

*Odell, S.J., and Ferraro, D.P. (1992). Teacher mentoring and teacher retention. Journal of Teacher Education, 43, 200-204.

MENTORS' OUTCOMES

Participation in the M.T.I.P. benefitted the M.T.I.P. mentors in a number of ways. Mentor respondents to the OER questionnaire indicated on a 4-point scale that the program had "increased their professional satisfaction" (M = 3.36), "increased their skills as a coach" (M = 3.51), and "increased their awareness of their own teaching methods" (M = 3.54). Furthermore, in commenting on ways that the program had been effective, many mentor respondents mentioned sharing and support (N = 83, 35 percent), the satisfaction of sharing one's expertise (N = 54, 23 percent), and the development of collegial relationships (N = 52, 22 percent). Mentor respondents to the OER questionnaire also indicated that their interns had helped them in a number of ways, giving feedback on demonstrations (N = 499, 70 percent), sharing literature on teaching/curriculum (N = 315, 44 percent), and sharing lesson plans (N = 239, 34 percent). In responses to an open-ended question on other ways that the interns had been of aid, mentors described a revitalized focus on teaching techniques (N = 18, 43 percent), and a sharing of experiences, problems, and coping mechanisms (N = 12, 29 percent). The Chancellor's Directive on the M.T.I.P. suggested that mentoring enables currently practicing teachers to grow professionally and increase their commitment to the teaching profession. These

data indicate that the mentors were indeed experiencing such benefits.

As shown in Tables 5 and 6**, those mentors who were involved in the various mentor models (same school/different school/retired or on leave) and those who had entered the program in the fall (1993) or in the spring (1994) were equally enthusiastic about the benefits of the program for themselves. However, as shown in Table 7, increase in satisfaction with the teaching profession was greater for those who were matched by license to at least one of their interns than for those who were not matched by license.

Interns' Professional Competence

The overall goal of the M.T.I.P. is to prepare (and then retain) an effective teaching force in New York City public schools. OER data indicated that the program was effective in assisting the interns to develop their teaching skills.

Mentors' assessment. The mentors who responded to the OER questionnaire rated the program's effectiveness in improving the interns' professional competence on a number of four-point scales (1 = not effective; 4 = highly effective). Overall

---

**Tables 5, 6, and 7 show mentors' responses to a number of questions as a function of mentor model, year of entry and mentor-intern match respectively. These tables will be referred to at several points in the narrative.

Table 5

Mean Ratings of Effectiveness of Program by Mentors as a Function of Mentor Model

Area	Mentor Model		
	Same School (N=484)	Different School (N=28)	Retired/Leave (N=179)
Mentors' Satisfaction with Program	3.34	3.23	3.46
Mentors' Coaching Skills	3.52	3.61	3.49
Mentors' Awareness of Teaching Methods	3.55	3.54	3.55
Interns' Ability to Instruct	3.36	3.50	3.43
Interns' Ability to Manage Class	3.37	3.30	3.27
Interns' Ability to Obtain Supplies	3.31	3.25	3.00[a]
Interns' Ability to Do Paperwork	3.27	3.18	3.16
Interns' Ability to Work with Faculty	3.19	3.00	3.18
Interns' Ability to Deal with Parents	3.02	2.90	3.00
Interns' Probability of Teaching in N.Y.C. public schools	3.48	3.77	3.48

[a] In the area, "interns' ability to obtain supplies," mentors who were active teachers rated the program as more effective than did retired/on leave teachers ($F = 8.39$, $p < .01$). In all other areas, mean ratings of effectiveness did not differ as a function of mentor model.

- In general, mentors' ratings of program effectiveness were high, above 3 on a 4-point scale.

Table 6

Mean Ratings of Effectiveness of Program
by Mentors who Entered M.T.I.P. in 1993 or 1994

Area	Year of Entering M.T.I.P. 1993	1994
Mentors' Satisfaction with Program	3.36	3.36
Mentors' Coaching Skills	3.50	3.51
Mentors' Awareness of Teaching Methods	3.56	3.53
Interns' Ability to Instruct	3.40	3.33
Interns' Ability to Manage Class	3.34	3.32
Interns' Ability to Obtain Supplies	3.27	3.14
Interns' Ability to Do Paperwork	3.27	3.18
Interns' Ability to Work with Faculty	3.18	3.17
Interns' Ability to Deal with Parents	3.03	2.97
Interns' Probability of Teaching in N.Y.C. public schools	3.53	3.44

- Mean ratings of effectiveness did not differ as a function of year of entry into the program.

Table 7

Mean Ratings of Effectiveness of Program
by Mentors Matched or Not Matched by License to Interns

Area	Mentor-Intern Match	
	Matched	Not Matched
Mentors' Satisfaction with Program	3.42	3.28[a]
Mentors' Coaching Skills	3.53	3.49
Mentors' Awareness of Teaching Methods	3.58	3.51
Interns' Ability to Instruct	3.45	3.29[a]
Interns' Ability to Manage Class	3.40	3.24[a]
Interns' Ability to Obtain Supplies	3.28	3.15
Interns' Ability to Do Paperwork	3.32	3.15[a]
Interns' Ability to Work with Faculty	3.21	3.15
Interns' Ability to Deal with Parents	3.09	2.90[a]
Interns' Probability of Teaching in N.Y.C. public schools	3.54	3.44

[a]Analyses of variance indicated that the matched mentors rated the effectiveness of the M.T.I.P. significantly higher than the mentors who were not matched by license to their interns ($p < .05$) in five areas: increasing mentors' own satisfaction with their profession, improving interns' ability to instruct, improving interns' ability to manage classroom, improving interns' ability to cope with paperwork, and improving interns' ability to deal with parents.

- Mentors who were matched by license to their interns rated the program more positively in a number of areas than did mentors not matched by license to their interns.

ratings were 3 or above on the program's effectiveness in improving all of the listed dimensions, including ability to instruct (M = 3.38), ability to manage classroom (M = 3.34), ability to obtain supplies/materials (M = 3.22), ability to cope with paperwork/regulations (M = 3.24), ability to work with fellow faculty (M = 3.18), and ability to deal with parents (M = 3.01). The mentors' reflective comments on their logs reinforced the conclusion that they saw a positive change in their interns. Some representative reflections were "My interns are well on their way to becoming excellent teachers." "I have seen great progress in both my interns." "I see a new confidence in the interns." "The interns are becoming more comfortable in their classrooms." "The intern's organization is better and so is his timing." "The intern has strengthened her classroom management techniques and her lesson planning techniques."

As shown in Table 5, statistical analyses indicated that mentor model was not a crucial influence, differentiating only mentors' responses to the item 'ability to obtain supplies/materials.' On that dimension, mentors who were active teachers felt that the M.T.I.P. was more effective than did those who were retired/on leave.

As shown in Table 6, mean ratings of program effectiveness were slightly higher on all dimensions for those who entered the program in 1993 rather than 1994. However, year of

program entry did not make a statistically significant difference in the ratings, contradicting data obtained in the 1992-93 OER evaluation. In that evaluation, it seemed that mentors who entered the program earlier believed it to be of more benefit. Moreover, in the 1993-94 responses, mentors most often (N = 135, 60 percent) responded to a question on how the program should be improved by suggesting that the program start at the beginning of the school year when help is most needed by the beginning teacher. However, as noted earlier in the report, in 1993-94, some unavoidable events (e.g., asbestos in the schools) caused a late start to the program, thus minimizing the advantage one would expect from beginning in the fall rather than the spring.

The one variable that did make a considerable difference to mentors' ratings of the program's effectiveness was mentor-intern matching by license, a result that supports the findings in the 1992-93 OER evaluation of the M.T.I.P. As shown in Table 7, those mentors who were matched by license to at least one of their interns rated the program as significantly more effective in improving the interns' ability to instruct, ability to manage the classroom, ability to cope with paperwork/regulations, and ability to deal with parents.

Interns' assessment. In a series of questions similar to those on the mentors' questionnaire, interns who responded to the OER questionnaire rated the program's effectiveness in

improving their own professional competence on a 4-point scale ranging from 1 (not effective) to 4 (highly effective). Overall ratings of the program's effectiveness were above 3 on only one of the items 'improving your ability to instruct' (M = 3.09); however, this is a crucial item, and the remaining ratings of the program's effectiveness in improving the intern's competence were closer to 3 than 2 (slightly effective) as follows: ability to manage classroom (M = 2.94), ability to obtain supplies/materials (M = 2.87), ability to cope with paperwork/regulations (M = 2.92), ability to work with fellow faculty (M = 2.85), and ability to deal with parents (M = 2.80). As shown in Table 8*, statistical analyses indicated that mentor model did not influence ratings of the program's effectiveness in improving the intern's professional competence. Similarly, as shown in Table 9, year of entering the program did not make a statistically significant difference. Both of these results parallel the pattern seen in the mentors' responses. Further, as was the case with the mentors, the one variable that did make a considerable difference in ratings of the program's effectiveness was mentor-intern matching. As shown in Table

---

*Tables 8, 9, and 10 show interns' responses to a number of questions as a function of mentor model, year of entry and mentor-intern match respectively. These tables will be referred to at several points in the narrative.

Table 8

Mean Ratings of Effectiveness of Program
by Interns in Various Mentor Models

Area	Mentor Model		
	Same School (N=347)	Different School (N=29)	Retired/Leave (N=154)
Interns' Ability to Instruct	3.07	3.39	3.06
Interns' Ability to Manage Class	2.98	3.19	2.82
Interns' Ability to Obtain Supplies	2.89	3.08	2.76
Interns' Ability to Do Paperwork	2.96	3.04	2.78
Interns' Ability to Work with Faculty	2.91	2.95	2.69
Interns' Ability to Deal with Parents	2.85	2.90	2.65
Interns' Probability of Teaching in N.Y.C. public schools	3.17	3.26	3.08

- In all areas, mean ratings of effectiveness did not differ as a function of mentor model.

Table 9

Mean Ratings of Effectiveness of Program
by Interns who Entered M.T.I.P. in 1993 or 1994

Area	Year of Entering M.T.I.P. 1993	1994
Interns' Ability to Instruct	3.03	3.14
Interns' Ability to Manage Class	2.92	2.96
Interns' Ability to Obtain Supplies	2.83	2.98
Interns' Ability to Do Paperwork	2.89	2.92
Interns' Ability to Work with Faculty	2.81	2.89
Interns' Ability to Deal with Parents	2.74	2.83
Interns' Probability of Teaching in N.Y.C. public schools	3.12	3.18

- Mean ratings of effectiveness did not differ as a function of year of entry into the program.

10, those interns who were matched by license to their mentor rated the program as significantly more effective in improving their ability to instruct, manage their classrooms, obtain supplies, cope with paperwork/regulations, work with fellow faculty, and deal with parents.

In a separate series of questions, interns who responded to the OER questionnaire rated their own level of comfort in a number of areas of their professional lives on a 4-point scale ranging from 1 (very uncomfortable) to 4 (very comfortable). Overall, the mean rating was 3 (slightly comfortable) or above for all areas with the exception of 'obtaining classroom materials,' possibly a response to budget difficulties in the N.Y.C. public schools. Since both the interns and the control groups were able to respond to this series of questions, statistical analyses were carried out to assess the differences between the groups. As shown in Table 11, there were no significant differences on any of the analyses, although an interesting pattern can be observed. The eligible unmentored control group rated themselves as particularly uncomfortable in three areas: dealing with behavior problems, dealing with a heavy workload, and obtaining classroom materials, presumably all areas in which they would have appreciated a mentor's guidance. Moreover, ratings of the 1993-94 mentored respondents appeared comparable to ratings of the 1992-93 mentored respondents.

Table 10

Mean Ratings of Effectiveness of Program
by Interns Matched or Not Matched by License to Mentor

Area	Mentor-Intern Match	
	Matched	Not Matched
Interns' Ability to Instruct	3.30	2.91[a]
Interns' Ability to Manage Class	3.10	2.82[a]
Interns' Ability to Obtain Supplies	3.03	2.79[a]
Interns' Ability to Do Paperwork	3.04	2.80[a]
Interns' Ability to Work with Faculty	2.98	2.75[a]
Interns' Ability to Deal with Parents	2.98	2.63[a]
Interns' Probability of Teaching in N.Y.C. public schools	3.29	3.03[a]

[a]Analyses of variance indicated that the matched interns rated the effectiveness of the M.T.I.P. significantly higher than the interns who were not matched by license to their mentors ($p < .05$) in all the listed areas.

- Interns who were matched by license to their mentors rated the program more positively in increasing their professional skills and also in increasing the probability that they would teach in N.Y.C. public schools in the future than did those who were not matched by license to their mentors.

Table 11

Mean Ratings of Comfort in Professional Areas
by Mentored and Unmentored Respondents

Area	Fall Intern	Spring Intern	Eligible Unmentored	1992-93 Interns
Disciplining/ Managing	3.28	3.30	3.23	3.28
Students at Different Levels	3.18	3.25	3.11	3.22
Behavior Problems	2.99	3.04	2.77	3.08
Learning Problems	2.92	3.08	2.95	3.01
Heavy Workload	2.96	3.05	2.91	3.15
Classroom Routine	3.40	3.44	3.43	3.42
Testing	3.10	3.24	3.22	3.24
Curriculum Guides	3.09	3.22	3.18	3.21
Lesson Plans	3.27	3.30	3.30	3.32
Paperwork	3.21	3.21	3.03	3.28
Materials	2.81	2.80	2.58	2.99
Administrative Personnel	3.17	3.23	3.23	3.27
Fellow Faculty	3.48	3.51	3.43	3.49
Parents	3.41	3.44	3.41	3.37
Confidence in Teaching	3.47	3.54	3.63	3.48

- There were no significant differences between 1993-94 mentored respondents and control respondents in ratings of comfort in academic areas.
- Comfort ratings of 1993-94 mentored respondents were comparable to comfort ratings of 1992-93 mentored respondents.

As shown in Tables 11 and 12, as was the case with other mentor and intern data, the year of program entry and the mentor model did not appear to influence responses to these questions on comfort with areas of professional life. Moreover, as can be seen in Table 13, the pattern was similar to that of the effectiveness responses in that mean responses to the comfort items were consistently (although in this case only slightly) higher for interns who were matched by license to their mentors than for interns who were not matched by license to their mentors.

RETENTION OF INTERNS

As noted above, improved retention of an effective teaching force was a major goal of the M.T.I.P. Both mentor and intern respondents considered the M.T.I.P. effective in this respect.

Mentors' Assessment

The mentors rated the program as close to 4 (M = 3.49) on effectiveness in increasing interns' probability of teaching in N.Y.C. public schools in the future. In a pattern similar to that noted with in other responses, as shown in Table 5, mentor model was not a differentiating variable; nor, as shown in Table 6, was year of program entry. However, mentor-intern match did appear to be an important variable, with the difference between those matched by license and those not matched approaching statistical significance (F = 3.6, p = .058).

Table 12

Mean Ratings of Comfort in Professional Areas by Interns in Various Mentor Models

Area	Mentor Model		
	Same School (N=342)	Different School (N=28)	Retired/Leave (N=149)
Disciplining/ Managing	3.32	3.32	3.18
Students at Different Levels	3.20	3.25	3.23
Behavior Problems	3.00	2.96	3.04
Learning Problems	3.00	3.00	2.97
Heavy Workload	3.01	2.82	3.00
Classroom Routine	3.44	3.43	3.32
Testing	3.19	2.89	3.11
Curriculum Guides	3.16	3.07	3.18
Lesson Plans	3.33	3.21	3.17
Paperwork	3.28	3.14	3.10
Materials	2.84	2.75	2.68
Administrative Personnel	3.18	3.36	3.22
Fellow Faculty	3.49	3.68	3.47
Parents	3.43	3.54	3.37
Confidence in Teaching	3.52	3.46	3.47

- Mean ratings of comfort did not differ as a function of mentor model.

Table 13

Mean Ratings of Comfort in Professional Areas
by Interns Matched or Not Matched by License to Mentor

Area	Mentor-Intern Match	
	Matched	Not Matched
Disciplining/ Managing	3.33	3.26
Students at Different Levels	3.26	3.17
Behavior Problems	3.05	2.96
Learning Problems	3.06	2.96
Heavy Workload	3.04	2.99
Classroom Routine	3.47	3.40
Testing	3.22	3.16
Curriculum Guides	3.24	3.12
Lesson Plans	3.35	3.27
Paperwork	3.29	3.16
Materials	2.88	2.73
Administrative Personnel	3.23	3.20
Fellow Faculty	3.55	3.47
Parents	3.46	3.40
Confidence in Teaching	3.52	3.51

- Mean ratings of comfort did not differ as a function of mentor-intern match in license area; however, interns who were matched consistently rated their comfort slightly higher than did interns who were not matched.

Interns' Assessment

As did the mentors, the interns saw the program as effective in increasing the probability that they would teach in N.Y.C. public schools in the future ($\underline{M}$ = 3.15). As shown in Tables 8 and 9, mentor model was not a significant differentiating variable and year of program entry was not a significant differentiating variable; however, as shown in Table 10, mentor-intern match was again an important variable, with interns who were matched by license to their mentors seeing the program as significantly more effective in increasing the probability that they would teach in N.Y.C. public schools in the future.

In a separate question, respondents were asked to indicate whether they planned to remain in N.Y.C. public schools as a long-term career, for 4-5 years, for 2-3 years, or leave after this year. Since both interns and unmentored respondents responded to this item, statistical analyses were carried out to assess the differences between the groups. As shown in Table 14, the percentages of those who planned to remain in the system for at least 4-5 years were virtually the same for the three groups, with most of the new teachers (approximately 85 percent) planning to teach for that length of time. Current literature* indicates that mentoring

*Odell, S.J. and Ferraro, D.P. (1992). Teacher mentoring and teacher retention. Journal of Teacher Education, 43, 200-204.

Table 14

Intention to Teach of Mentored and Unmentored Respondents

Response	Percent of Group Choosing Response		
	Fall Intern	Spring Intern	Eligible Unmentored
Long-term plans to teach	70	70	75
Plan to teach for 4-5 years	16	15	12
Plan to teach for 2-3 years	12	11	10
May leave teaching after this year	2	4	3

- Intention to teach did not differ for mentored and control respondents.
- Overall, very few respondents were planning to leave teaching at the end of the school year.

programs can influence actual retention of teachers. However, these data indicate that the M.T.I.P. did not alter the interns' plans to remain in the system, perhaps because, even in the control group, the predominant intention was to remain in the system for a considerable length of time.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The M.T.I.P. was a challenging program to organize and maintain and, given a late start due to asbestos in the schools, 1993-94 was a difficult year in which to implement such a program. However, the M.T.I.P. was carefully administered by the B.O.E. in collaboration with the UFT and with the cooperation of a number of offices and personnel, including the MASCs, the U.F.T. district representatives, the district liaisons, and the chapter leaders. Moreover, the data indicated that the M.T.I.P. had positive effects on both the interns and their mentors.

The interns, in general, were satisfied with the help they received from the program and felt that the level of support they received from supervisors and colleagues had increased as a result of their participation in the M.T.I.P. The interns indicated that they particularly valued the discussions of professional practices, demonstration lessons, and the encouragement and support that they had received.

The mentors also benefitted from participation in the M.T.I.P. They reported that serving as a mentor had increased their sense of satisfaction with the profession, their coaching skills, and their awareness of their own teaching techniques. Furthermore, they noted that serving as a coach had provided them with the satisfaction of sharing their expertise and the opportunity to develop collegial relationships with new teachers.

The major goals of the M.T.I.P. were to improve the effectiveness of teaching and to improve the retention of new

teachers. Unlike the data obtained in an OER evaluation of the M.T.I.P. in 1992-93, in the current year, entering the program earlier (1993 rather than 1994), did not affect the ability of the program to meet both these goals. However, due to asbestos in the schools and a late start to the school year, many of those who entered the program in 1993 did so toward the end of the fall semester.

The mentor model (a variable that was not a focus in the 1992-93 OER evaluation) also did not affect the ability of the 1993-94 program to meet the goals, perhaps because the presence of a mentor is more important than the mentor's active/inactive status.

The match between the license of the mentor and the intern was the one variable that influenced the outcomes both in 1992-93 and in the current data. In 1993-94, mentors who were matched by license to their interns experienced a greater increase in satisfaction in the teaching profession and rated the M.T.I.P. more highly on its effectiveness in increasing the interns' professional skills. Interns who were matched by license to their mentors were more satisfied with the help they received and rated the program more highly on its effectiveness in increasing their own professional skills and increasing the probability that they would teach in the N.Y.C. public schools in the future.

Based on the findings of the evaluation, OER makes the following specific recommendations.

- The M.T.I.P. should be retained as a way to increase and maintain an effective teaching force in the N.Y.C. public schools.

- The M.T.I.P. should begin as early in the school year as possible, in order to minimize classroom disruption and maximize benefit to the new teachers.

- The strongest emphasis in selection of mentors should be placed on matching mentors to interns, with less emphasis on the mentor being an active teacher in the same school as the intern. The data indicated that mentor-intern match influenced the achievement of the M.T.I.P. goals, presumably because matched mentors are better able to communicate with and to guide their interns.

- To facilitate an early start to the program and appropriate mentor-intern matching, an effort should be made to broaden the mentor pool, either by increased use of retirees or by offering a variety of incentives to active teachers.

- Funding should allow all mentors, whether new or experienced, to attend the initial two-hour orientation in order to acquaint them with changes in program organization.

- All mentors should be provided with the full complement of released periods stipulated in the program guidelines to enable them to visit the intern's classroom and participate in a weekly mentor-intern conference.

- If high quality coverage is not available for mentors, then either district provision of staff development for coverage teachers should be instituted or alternate arrangements such as increased use of retirees, cluster teachers, or district-office mentors should be considered.

- Future evaluations should pay some attention to the differences between the organization and effects of the M.T.I.P. in elementary schools vs. intermediate/junior high schools, and high schools.

- The Office of Monitoring and School Improvement must verify and insure that members are receiving the periods they are entitled to in order to serve their interns.

- Continue the college course component for the interns' skills development and application in the classroom, and increase the dissemination of this service so that more interns have the opportunity to enroll in courses.